

michael ritzcovan  
39 spring st  
south salem, ny 10590

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Commissioner Michael J. Copps.

Thousands of American consumers have already expressed their opposition to the FCC's adoption of a "broadcast flag". I am writing to join them. As a user of open-source software, adoption of the broadcast flag will mean I am unable to receive digital television broadcasts on my computer.

Adopting the broadcast flag will make the FCC stand for "Federal Computer Control" which is outside its proper role. It is not the FCC's place to effectively choose the software licenses or computer operating systems that consumers must use in order to watch digital television broadcast on their computers.

Additionally, adoption of the broadcast flag will harm innovation. Many users of open-source software are computer programmers and "tinkerers" who work to improve the software. Their contributions and constant innovation is what makes open-source software able to compete in the marketplace.

The broadcast flag rule advocated by the MPAA will ban open-source implementations of VSB and QAM modulators and demodulators, preventing open-source programmers from innovating in field of digital communications techniques used by television.

Most Americans assumed that when television became digital, viewers would be able to do more with television programming, not less. Without innovative new products and flexibility in the ways consumers are able to watch TV, consumers will be less inclined to invest in the equipment to view digital television. Therefore, the broadcast flag is likely to slow adoption of digital television in addition to making it illegal to watch digital television on a computer using open-source software. It is for these reasons I urge you to promote the digital television transition by opposing adoption of the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

michael ritzcovan

October 30, 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Michael Copps,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Chris Brightly  
9205 Bethania Ct  
Richmond, VA 23228  
USA

October 30, 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D C 20554

Dear Michael Copps,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television.

As a result of the mis-guided DMCA, consumer rights and fair use have already been trampled, I am loathe to see the trend continued.

As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

Digital televisions are already extremely expensive, heaping additional costs onto them will keep many people out of them even longer.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Jason Kulas  
493 Madison Rd  
Durham, CT 06422  
USA

Thursday, October 30 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20554

VIA FACSIMILE

Dear Commissioner Copps,

As a consumer of broadcast television, electronics, and computer products, I urge the Federal Communications Commission to vote against the adoption of a "broadcast flag." I am gravely concerned that a broadcast flag regulation would restrict the way I enjoy television.

The digital television transition relies on convincing consumers of the benefits of switching to and buying digital television equipment. That transition will be far more palatable to me as a consumer if switching doesn't mean discarding my existing home network, buying new high-resolution displays, and finding room for yet another device in my living room. Please do not allow the MPAA and its allies to hinder the transition by making us buy special-purpose DTV devices that are more expensive and less valuable.

In addition, I am very concerned about the fair-use implications of the broadcast flag. With today's technology, I can be more than a passive recipient of content -- I can modify, create, and participate. I can record TV to watch later, clip a small piece of TV and splice it into a home movie, send an email clip of my child's football game to a distant relative, or record a TV program onto a DVD and play it at my friend's apartment. The broadcast flag seems designed to remove this control and flexibility that I enjoy.

If the move to digital television does not make the public's viewing experience more enjoyable, flexible, and exciting, what compelling reason do I have as a consumer to buy new digital equipment? A prettier TV picture is hardly enough reason for me to dispense with all my current consumer electronics and computer equipment. As a citizen and consumer of broadcast television, I urge you to promote the digital transition by opposing the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

Gary Danielson  
1005 N. State St.  
Painesville, OH 44077

Thursday, October 30 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20554

VIA FACSIMILE

Dear Commissioner Copps,

I do not want the broadcast flag adopted. I don't want the copyright industry telling the consumer electronics' industry what to make, I do not want copyright to trump free speech, innovation, future jobs and health insurance, and the freedom of our society to express itself. There are other ways to protect copyright holders. And, as the copyright industries own researchers, Informa Media, has told them, transmission over the internet of video and TV WILL NOT BE A PROBLEM until 2020.... Don't buy what the MPAA says. It's incorrect. They don't understand because they are scared of ending up like the RIAA. But their situation is different and it can't be solved with a broadcast flag. Please do the right thing and don't adopt it.

Consumers will also suffer, because they will have to spend hundreds of dollars to upgrade to digital equipment. Why? For a problem that doesn't exist, for a technology that hampers innovation and new jobs and industries, and at the expense of fair use? Crazy. Don't do it. Mary

Sincerely,

Mary Hodder  
2418 fulton street  
Berkeley, CA 94704

Thursday, October 30, 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20554

VIA FACSIMILE

Dear Commissioner Copps,

As a consumer of broadcast television, electronics, and computer products, I urge the Federal Communications Commission to vote against the adoption of a "broadcast flag." I am gravely concerned that a broadcast flag regulation would restrict the way I enjoy television.

The digital television transition relies on convincing consumers of the benefits of switching to and buying digital television equipment. That transition will be far more palatable to me as a consumer if switching doesn't mean discarding my existing home network, buying new high-resolution displays, and finding room for yet another device in my living room. Please do not allow the MPAA and its allies to hinder the transition by making us buy special-purpose DTV devices that are more expensive and less valuable.

In addition, I am very concerned about the fair-use implications of the broadcast flag. With today's technology, I can be more than a passive recipient of content -- I can modify, create, and participate. I can record TV to watch later, clip a small piece of TV and splice it into a home movie, send an email clip of my child's football game to a distant relative, or record a TV program onto a DVD and play it at my friend's apartment. The broadcast flag seems designed to remove this control and flexibility that I enjoy.

If the move to digital television does not make the public's viewing experience more enjoyable, flexible, and exciting, what compelling reason do I have as a consumer to buy new digital equipment? A prettier TV picture is hardly enough reason for me to dispense with all my current consumer electronics and computer equipment. As a citizen and consumer of broadcast television, I urge you to promote the digital transition by opposing the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

Geoff Mitchell  
110 Candlewyck Ter  
Portland, ME 04102

Thursday, October 30 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20554

VIA FACSIMILE

Dear Commissioner Copps,

As a consumer of broadcast television, electronics, and computer products, I urge the Federal Communications Commission to vote against the adoption of a "broadcast flag." I am gravely concerned that a broadcast flag regulation would restrict the way I enjoy television.

The digital television transition relies on convincing consumers of the benefits of switching to and buying digital television equipment. That transition will be far more palatable to me as a consumer if switching doesn't mean discarding my existing home network, buying new high-resolution displays, and finding room for yet another device in my living room. Please do not allow the MPAA and its allies to hinder the transition by making us buy special-purpose DTV devices that are more expensive and less valuable.

In addition, I am very concerned about the fair-use implications of the broadcast flag. With today's technology, I can be more than a passive recipient of content -- I can modify, create, and participate. I can record TV to watch later; clip a small piece of TV and splice it into a home movie; send an email clip of my child's football game to a distant relative; or record a TV program onto a DVD and play it at my friend's apartment. The broadcast flag seems designed to remove this control and flexibility that I enjoy.

If the move to digital television does not make the public's viewing experience more enjoyable, flexible, and exciting, what compelling reason do I have as a consumer to buy new digital equipment? A prettier TV picture is hardly enough reason for me to dispense with all my current consumer electronics and computer equipment. As a citizen and consumer of broadcast television, I urge you to promote the digital transition by opposing the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

Aaron Bartlett  
5579 Carnegie Loop  
Livermore, CA 94550

Thursday, October 30 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20554

VIA FACSIMILE

Dear Commissioner Copps,

As a consumer of broadcast television, electronics, and computer products, I urge the Federal Communications Commission to vote against the adoption of a "broadcast flag." I am gravely concerned that a broadcast flag regulation would restrict the way I enjoy television.

The digital television transition relies on convincing consumers of the benefits of switching to and buying digital television equipment. That transition will be far more palatable to me as a consumer if switching doesn't mean discarding my existing home network, buying new high-resolution displays, and finding room for yet another device in my living room. Please do not allow the MPAA and its allies to hinder the transition by making us buy special-purpose DTV devices that are more expensive and less valuable.

In addition, I am very concerned about the fair-use implications of the broadcast flag. With today's technology, I can be more than a passive recipient of content -- I can modify, create, and participate. I can record TV to watch later, clip a small piece of TV and splice it into a home movie, send an email clip of my child's football game to a distant relative, or record a TV program onto a DVD and play it at my friend's apartment. The broadcast flag seems designed to remove this control and flexibility that I enjoy.

If the move to digital television does not make the public's viewing experience more enjoyable, flexible, and exciting, what compelling reason do I have as a consumer to buy new digital equipment? A prettier TV picture is hardly enough reason for me to dispense with all my current consumer electronics and computer equipment. As a citizen and consumer of broadcast television, I urge you to promote the digital transition by opposing the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

David Collins  
5375 castlebrooke crossing dr  
Cumming, GA 30040



Thursday, October 30 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20554

VIA FACSIMILE

Dear Commissioner Copps,

As a consumer of broadcast television, electronics, and computer products, I urge the Federal Communications Commission to vote against the adoption of a "broadcast flag." I am gravely concerned that a broadcast flag regulation would restrict the way I enjoy television.

The digital television transition relies on convincing consumers of the benefits of switching to and buying digital television equipment. That transition will be far more palatable to me as a consumer if switching doesn't mean discarding my existing home network, buying new high-resolution displays, and finding room for yet another device in my living room. Please do not allow the MPAA and its allies to hinder the transition by making us buy special-purpose DTV devices that are more expensive and less valuable.

In addition, I am very concerned about the fair-use implications of the broadcast flag. With today's technology, I can be more than a passive recipient of content -- I can modify, create, and participate. I can record TV to watch later; clip a small piece of TV and splice it into a home movie; send an email clip of my child's football game to a distant relative; or record a TV program onto a DVD and play it at my friend's apartment. The broadcast flag seems designed to remove this control and flexibility that I enjoy.

If the move to digital television does not make the public's viewing experience more enjoyable, flexible, and exciting, what compelling reason do I have as a consumer to buy new digital equipment? A prettier TV picture is hardly enough reason for me to dispense with all my current consumer electronics and computer equipment. As a citizen and consumer of broadcast television, I urge you to promote the digital transition by opposing the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

David L. Lautenschlager  
4201 Reserve Drive  
Atlanta, GA 30319

Thursday, October 30, 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20554

VIA FACSIMILE

Dear Commissioner Copps,

As a consumer of broadcast television, electronics, and computer products, I urge the Federal Communications Commission to vote against the adoption of a "broadcast flag." I am gravely concerned that a broadcast flag regulation would restrict the way I enjoy television.

The digital television transition relies on convincing consumers of the benefits of switching to and buying digital television equipment. That transition will be far more palatable to me as a consumer if switching doesn't mean discarding my existing home network, buying new high-resolution displays, and finding room for yet another device in my living room. Please do not allow the MPAA and its allies to hinder the transition by making us buy special-purpose DTV devices that are more expensive and less valuable.

In addition, I am very concerned about the fair-use implications of the broadcast flag. With today's technology, I can be more than a passive recipient of content -- I can modify, create, and participate. I can record TV to watch later; clip a small piece of TV and splice it into a home movie; send an email clip of my child's football game to a distant relative; or record a TV program onto a DVD and play it at my friend's apartment. The broadcast flag seems designed to remove this control and flexibility that I enjoy.

If the move to digital television does not make the public's viewing experience more enjoyable, flexible, and exciting, what compelling reason do I have as a consumer to buy new digital equipment? A prettier TV picture is hardly enough reason for me to dispense with all my current consumer electronics and computer equipment. As a citizen and consumer of broadcast television, I urge you to promote the digital transition by opposing the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

John B. Simon  
3320 Powelton Avenue  
Philadelphia, PA 19104

October 31, 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Michael Copps,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Jeremy Reichman  
545 Robert Quigley Dr, Apt #1  
Scottsville, NY 14546  
USA

Scott Phelan  
340 Blaine St  
Bangor, PA 18013

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Commissioner Michael J. Copps:

Thousands of American consumers have already expressed their opposition to the FCC's adoption of a "broadcast flag". I am writing to join them. As a user of open-source software, adoption of the broadcast flag will mean I am unable to receive digital television broadcasts on my computer.

Adopting the broadcast flag will make the FCC stand for "Federal Computer Control" which is outside its proper role. It is not the FCC's place to effectively choose the software licenses or computer operating systems that consumers must use in order to watch digital television broadcast on their computers.

Additionally, adoption of the broadcast flag will harm innovation. Many users of open-source software are computer programmers and "tinkerers" who work to improve the software. Their contributions and constant innovation is what makes open-source software able to compete in the marketplace.

The broadcast flag rule advocated by the MPAA will ban open-source implementations of VSB and QAM modulators and demodulators, preventing open-source programmers from innovating in field of digital communications techniques used by television.

Most Americans assumed that when television became digital, viewers would be able to do more with television programming, not less. Without innovative new products and flexibility in the ways consumers are able to watch TV, consumers will be less inclined to invest in the equipment to view digital television. Therefore, the broadcast flag is likely to slow adoption of digital television in addition to making it illegal to watch digital television on a computer using open-source software. It is for these reasons I urge you to promote the digital television transition by opposing adoption of the broadcast flag.

Implementing a broadcast flag is in direct contradiction with your own stated goals.

Your goals are shown here with my comments.

Objectives:

Foster sustainable competition across the entire telecommunications sector.

\*\*\*The broadcast flag will immediately lock out all open source software as a competitor in the TV industry.\*\*\*

Facilitate a more effective wholesale market through interconnection policy and other competition-related rules.

\*\*\* The broadcast flag will reduce the ability to interconnect services \*\*\*

Promote and advance universal service.

**\*\* The broadcast flag does the opposite, it does not promote, it retards. \*\*\***

Ensure that consumers have choices among communication services and are protected from anti-competitive behavior in the increasingly competitive telecommunications landscape.

**\*\*\* You are severely limiting my choices \*\*\***

Continually evaluate and report on the competitive environment for communications services

**\*\*\* Your evaluation should show that this is a bad move \*\*\***

The air waves are for the people, it is your responsibility to keep it available and open to the people!

Sincerely,

Scott Phelan

October 30, 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Michael Copps,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Matthew Hiltola  
891 Harris Road  
Grayslake, IL 60030  
USA

Daniel P. Valentine  
P. O. Box 380131  
Cambridge, MA 02238

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Commissioner Michael J. Copps:

Thousands of American consumers have already expressed their opposition to the FCC's adoption of a "broadcast flag". I am writing to join them. As a user of free software, I would be injured by the adoption of the broadcast flag rule as it would make me unable to receive digital television broadcasts on my computer.

Adopting the broadcast flag will make the FCC stand for "Federal Computer Control" which is outside its proper role. It is not the FCC's place to effectively choose the software licenses or computer operating systems that consumers must use in order to watch digital television broadcast on their computers.

Additionally, adoption of the broadcast flag will harm innovation. Many users of free software are computer programmers and "tinkerers" who work to improve the software. Our contributions and constant innovation is what makes free software able to compete in the marketplace.

The broadcast flag rule advocated by the MPAA will ban free-software implementations of VSB and QAM modulators and demodulators, preventing free-software programmers from innovating in field of digital communications techniques used by television.

Most Americans assumed that when television became digital, viewers would be able to do more with television programming, not less. Without innovative new products and flexibility in the ways consumers are able to watch TV, consumers will be less inclined to invest in the equipment to view digital television. Therefore, the broadcast flag is likely to slow adoption of digital television in addition to making it illegal to watch digital television on a computer using free software. It is for these reasons I urge you to promote the digital television transition by opposing adoption of the broadcast flag.

I am disturbed that the FCC is considering a rule that would make it illegal for me to make fair use of broadcast television programming. Now that it is possible for me to store programs I can't watch because I am at work or otherwise occupied on my computer rather than my VCR, I fully intend to do so. It is unfortunate that it is considered necessary to outlaw useful tools just because some people might use them to break copyright laws. The many uses that would not violate the laws should not be infringed upon just to keep the media conglomerates happy or to force people to abandon superior free-software operating systems just to enable the fair use of broadcast television.

Sincerely,

Daniel P. Valentine

October 30, 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Michael Copps,

I am writing to voice my opposition to any FCC-mandated adoption of "broadcast flag" technology for digital television. As a consumer and citizen, I feel strongly that such a policy would be bad for innovation, consumer rights, and the ultimate adoption of DTV.

A robust, competitive market for consumer electronics must be rooted in manufacturers' ability to innovate for their customers. Allowing movie studios to veto features of DTV-reception equipment will enable the studios to tell technologists what new products they can create. This will result in products that don't necessarily reflect what consumers like me actually want, and it could result in me being charged more money for inferior functionality.

If the FCC issues a broadcast flag mandate, I would actually be less likely to make an investment in DTV-capable receivers and other equipment. I will not pay more for devices that limit my rights at the behest of Hollywood. Please do not mandate broadcast flag technology for digital television. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Antony Tovar  
8382 Finley Ave  
La Mesa, CA 91941  
USA



James A. Napolitano  
10 Radburn Dr.  
Commack, NY 11725-1117

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Commissioner Michael J. Copps:

Thousands of American consumers have already expressed their opposition to the FCC's adoption of a "broadcast flag". I am writing to join them. As a user of open-source software, adoption of the broadcast flag will mean I am unable to receive digital television broadcasts on my computer.

Adopting the broadcast flag will make the FCC stand for "Federal Computer Control" which is outside its proper role. It is not the FCC's place to effectively choose the software licenses or computer operating systems that consumers must use in order to watch digital television broadcast on their computers.

Additionally, adoption of the broadcast flag will harm innovation. Many users of open-source software are computer programmers and "tinkerers" who work to improve the software. Their contributions and constant innovation is what makes open-source software able to compete in the marketplace.

The broadcast flag rule advocated by the MPAA will ban open-source implementations of VSB and QAM modulators and demodulators, preventing open-source programmers from innovating in field of digital communications techniques used by television.

Most Americans assumed that when television became digital, viewers would be able to do more with television programming, not less. Without innovative new products and flexibility in the ways consumers are able to watch TV, consumers will be less inclined to invest in the equipment to view digital television. Therefore, the broadcast flag is likely to slow adoption of digital television in addition to making it illegal to watch digital television on a computer using open-source software. It is for these reasons I urge you to promote the digital television transition by opposing adoption of the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

James A. Napolitano

John Comeau  
7532 McKinley St.  
Hollywood FL 33024

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Commissioner Michael J. Copps

Thousands of American consumers have already expressed their opposition to the FCC's adoption of a "broadcast flag". I am writing to join them. As a user of open-source software, adoption of the broadcast flag will mean I am unable to receive digital television broadcasts on my computer. As a writer of open-source software, it puts "legal" restrictions on my creativity and sets a dangerous precedent for further restricting what programmers and users can do with their own computers.

Adopting the broadcast flag will make the FCC stand for "Federal Computer Control" which is outside its proper role. It is not the FCC's place to effectively choose the software licenses or computer operating systems that consumers must use in order to watch digital television broadcast on their computers.

Additionally, adoption of the broadcast flag will harm innovation. Many users of open-source software are computer programmers and "tinkerers" who work to improve the software. Their contributions and constant innovation is what makes open-source software able to compete in the marketplace.

The broadcast flag rule advocated by the MPAA will ban open-source implementations of VSB and QAM modulators and demodulators, preventing open-source programmers from innovating in field of digital communications techniques used by television

Most Americans assumed that when television became digital, viewers would be able to do more with television programming, not less. Without innovative new products and flexibility in the ways consumers are able to watch TV, consumers will be less inclined to invest in the equipment to view digital television. Therefore, the broadcast flag is likely to slow adoption of digital television in addition to making it illegal to watch digital television on a computer using open-source software. It is for these reasons I urge you to promote the digital television transition by opposing adoption of the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

John Comeau

Andrew Waterman  
PO Box 181  
Berkeley, CA 94703

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D C. 20554

Dear Commissioner Michael J. Copps:

Could we please have a responsible government, that is not completely under the heel of large corporations? Is it really that hard? I mean, first you (the fcc) encouraged more monopoly control of the ownership of broadcasting stations and now you're going to attempt to make free software illegal for receiving the broadcasts of those same large corporations? Show some backbone! Act like an American!!! The republican leadership of this country is beginningg to depress me Why don't you all just start getting paychecks from Disney and friends instead of my own pocketbook? I really would like to see things get better not worse.

Anyway, Stallman's message follows:

Thousands of American consumers have already expressed their opposition to the FCC's adoption of a "broadcast flag". I am writing to join them. As a user of open-source software, adoption of the broadcast flag will mean I am unable to receive digital television broadcasts on my computer.

Adopting the broadcast flag will make the FCC stand for "Federal Computer Control" which is outside its proper role. It is not the FCC's place to effectively choose the software licenses or computer operating systems that consumers must use in order to watch digital television broadcast on their computers.

Additionally, adoption of the broadcast flag will harm innovation. Many users of open-source software are computer programmers and "tinkerers" who work to improve the software. Their contributions and constant innovation is what makes open-source software able to compete in the marketplace.

The broadcast flag rule advocated by the MPAA will ban open-source implementations of VSB and QAM modulators and demodulators, preventing open-source programmers from innovating in field of digital communications techniques used by television.

Most Americans assumed that when television became digital, viewers would be able to do more with television programming, not less. Without innovative new products and flexibility in the ways consumers are able to watch TV, consumers will be less inclined to invest in the equipment to view digital television. Therefore, the broadcast flag is likely to slow adoption of digital television in addition to making it illegal to watch digital television on a computer using open-source software. It is for these reasons I urge you to promote the digital television transition by opposing adoption of the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

Andrew Waterman

Robert Sandling  
4919 Westshire Drive  
Comstock Park, MI 49321

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Commissioner Michael J. Copps:

Thousands of American consumers have already expressed their opposition to the FCC's adoption of a "broadcast flag". I am writing to join them. As a user of open-source software, adoption of the broadcast flag will mean I am unable to receive digital television broadcasts on my computer.

Adopting the broadcast flag will make the FCC stand for "Federal Computer Control" which is outside its proper role. It is not the FCC's place to effectively choose the software licenses or computer operating systems that consumers must use in order to watch digital television broadcast on their computers.

Additionally, adoption of the broadcast flag will harm innovation. Many users of open-source software are computer programmers and "tinkerers" who work to improve the software. Their contributions and constant innovation is what makes open-source software able to compete in the marketplace.

The broadcast flag rule advocated by the MPAA will ban open-source implementations of VSB and QAM modulators and demodulators, preventing open-source programmers from innovating in field of digital communications techniques used by television.

Most Americans assumed that when television became digital, viewers would be able to do more with television programming, not less. Without innovative new products and flexibility in the ways consumers are able to watch TV, consumers will be less inclined to invest in the equipment to view digital television. Therefore, the broadcast flag is likely to slow adoption of digital television in addition to making it illegal to watch digital television on a computer using open-source software. It is for these reasons I urge you to promote the digital television transition by opposing adoption of the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

Robert Sandling

Mark Poweski  
2404 Morning Glory  
Richardson, TX 75082

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Commissioner Michael J. Copps

Thousands of American consumers have already expressed their opposition to the FCC's adoption of a "broadcast flag". I am writing to join them. As a user of open-source software, adoption of the broadcast flag will mean I am unable to receive digital television broadcasts on my computer.

Adopting the broadcast flag will make the FCC stand for "Federal Computer Control" which is outside its proper role. It is not the FCC's place to effectively choose the software licenses or computer operating systems that consumers must use in order to watch digital television broadcast on their computers.

Additionally, adoption of the broadcast flag will harm innovation. Many users of open-source software are computer programmers and "tinkerers" who work to improve the software. Their contributions and constant innovation is what makes open-source software able to compete in the marketplace.

For example, TIVO has been become modifiable and made much more valuable to the owner by the use of open software

patches and suggested hardware modifications. Do you think Bill Gates/Microsoft updates or improves its products except when he faces the loss of marketshare

(Sun StarOffice which is almost open source) or he becomes the subject of a lawsuit.

The broadcast flag rule advocated by the MPAA will ban open-source implementations of VSB and QAM modulators and demodulators, preventing open-source programmers from innovating in field of digital communications techniques used by television.

Most Americans assumed that when television became digital, viewers would be able to do more with television programming, not less. Without innovative new products and flexibility in the ways consumers are able to watch TV, consumers will be less inclined to invest in the equipment to view digital television. Therefore, the broadcast flag is likely to slow adoption of digital television in addition to making it illegal to watch digital television on a computer using open-source software. It is for these reasons I urge you to promote the digital television transition by opposing adoption of the broadcast flag.

Finally, your mandate is for broadcast and transmission not

for post reception transmission. Stay out of what is not your business!

Sincerely,

Mark Poweski

Paul Gnuyen  
507 Encinitas Way #C  
Placentia, CA 92870

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Commissioner Michael J. Copps:

The broadcast flag will prevent innovation amongst one of the biggest group of software developers in the world. Illegalizing full featured software based HDTV receivers will result in a stymied pace of development in what is clearly the desired path of broadcast development. I urge you to consider the ramifications of your decision and side on the side of free development.

Thank you for your time, and I hope you consider what I have said.

Paul Gnuyen

[gnuyen@gnuyen.org](mailto:gnuyen@gnuyen.org)

Sincerely,

Paul Gnuyen

Steven Carrington  
PO Box 3333  
Palmer, AK 99645

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Commissioner Michael J. Copps:

Innovation is one of the things that makes America a great nation. Let's now short-circuit people's creativity and deaden their innovation by only letting 'hackers' be able to innovate with technology.

Thousands of American consumers have already expressed their opposition to the FCC's adoption of a "broadcast flag". I am writing to join them. As a user of open-source software, adoption of the broadcast flag will mean I am unable to receive digital television broadcasts on my computer.

Adopting the broadcast flag will make the FCC stand for "Federal Computer Control" which is outside its proper role. It is not the FCC's place to effectively choose the software licenses or computer operating systems that consumers must use in order to watch digital television broadcast on their computers.

Additionally, adoption of the broadcast flag will harm innovation. Many users of open-source software are computer programmers and "tinkerers" who work to improve the software. Their contributions and constant innovation is what makes open-source software able to compete in the marketplace.

The broadcast flag rule advocated by the MPAA will ban open-source implementations of VSB and QAM modulators and demodulators, preventing open-source programmers from innovating in field of digital communications techniques used by television.

Most Americans assumed that when television became digital, viewers would be able to do more with television programming, not less. Without innovative new products and flexibility in the ways consumers are able to watch TV, consumers will be less inclined to invest in the equipment to view digital television. Therefore, the broadcast flag is likely to slow adoption of digital television in addition to making it illegal to watch digital television on a computer using open-source software. It is for these reasons I urge you to promote the digital television transition by opposing adoption of the broadcast flag.

Sincerely,

Steven Carrington

Kaustabh Duorah  
3 Haley Ridge Rd  
Beacon Falls, CT 06403

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D C 20554

Dear Commissioner Michael J. Copps:

Thousands of American consumers have already expressed their opposition to the FCC's adoption of a "broadcast flag". I am writing to join them. As a user of open-source software, adoption of the broadcast flag will mean I am unable to receive digital television broadcasts on my computer.

Adopting the broadcast flag will make the FCC stand for "Federal Computer Control" which is outside its proper role. It is not the FCC's place to effectively choose the software licenses or computer operating systems that consumers must use in order to watch digital television broadcast on their computers.

Additionally, adoption of the broadcast flag will harm innovation. Many users of open-source software are computer programmers and "tinkerers" who work to improve the software. Their contributions and constant innovation is what makes open-source software able to compete in the marketplace.

The broadcast flag rule advocated by the MPAA will ban open-source implementations of VSB and QAM modulators and demodulators, preventing open-source programmers from innovating in field of digital communications techniques used by television.

Most Americans assumed that when television became digital, viewers would be able to do more with television programming, not less. Without innovative new products and flexibility in the ways consumers are able to watch TV, consumers will be less inclined to invest in the equipment to view digital television. Therefore, the broadcast flag is likely to slow adoption of digital television in addition to making it illegal to watch digital television on a computer using open-source software. It is for these reasons I urge you to promote the digital television transition by opposing adoption of the broadcast flag

Sincerely,

Kaustabh Duorah



Craig Myers  
1062 Rustling Oaks Drive  
Millersville, MD 21108

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Commissioner Michael J. Copps:

Sirs,

I feel it is ineffective and inappropriate for the Federal Communications Commission to regulate software activities. I understand the FCC is considering rules or regulations that will make it illegal to write or use software that processes digital tv content that has a "broadcast flag" set. I am not in favor of this effort.

Existing laws are designed to protect the property rights of creative works. Banning software efforts because they "might" be used to break the law is not effective and unamerican. As a user of open-source software, adoption of the broadcast flag will mean I am unable to receive digital television broadcasts on my computer.

I am currently building my own "Home Theater PC" that will provide wife friendly operation of the myriad devices within a modern home entertainment system. Integral to such a system is the ability to bring in broadcast HDTV signals to a computer, format them and display them on a monitor (or TV). I will be using open source software and writing my own. I have no intention of violating copyrights. As a successful middle class adult, I represent the target market for HDTV products and services.

The motion picture industry will have to make a value judgement, is the profit to be realized from digital TV transmission worth the risk of improper copying. All the copying methods the MPAA fears for digital TV are possible now, so the broadcast flag law is too little, too late. With or without the broadcast flag, knowledgeable people with the desire to cheat will be able to do so.

I think the RIAA's recent efforts to sue or prosecute copyright violators is the correct approach. Use the laws and the judicial system to protect your rights. Trying to legislate limitations on technology is ineffective and unamerican.

Thank you for your interest.

Sincerely,

Craig Myers